LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH — R.P.A.

COAL SITUATION IN GREAT BRITAIN — Arthur Horner

ECONOMIC SITUATION AND LABOUR POLICY — Maurice Dobb

WESTERN BLOC — William Rust

FRANCE AND EUROPE — Clemens Dutt

PROBLEMS OF LABOUR UNITY IN NORWAY — George Rude

DAWN OVER EAST ASIA — Arthur Clegg

BOOK REVIEWS

PROBLEMS OF PEACE

6D

OCTOBER 1945

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVII. No. 10

CONTENTS

October, 1945

	Page
Notes of the Month—*Problems of Peace* by R. P. A.	289
Coal Situation in Great Britain by ARTHUR HORNER	293
Economic Situation and Labour Policy by MAURICE DOBB	299
Western Bloc by WILLIAM RUST	304
France and Europe by CLEMENS DUTT	308
Problems of Labour Unity in Norway by GEORGE RUDE	310
Dawn over East Asia by ARTHUR CLEGG	314
Book Reviews—	
Patrick Geddes by H. S. P.	319
Shorter Notice by M.C.	320

APPLICATION FOR POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION

NAME..... ADDRESS.....

(*Please use Block Capitals*)

.....

.....

I am a regular reader of LABOUR MONTHLY and I wish to become a postal subscriber. I enclose $\frac{7/\text{- (Home)}}{8/\text{- (Abroad)}}$ to cover 12 months' subscription beginning with the

.....issue.

(*Strike out the words which do not apply*).

Signed.....

Date.....

DO IT NOW!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

(The Notes of the Month by R.P.D. *will be resumed in November.*—ED. L.M.)

Problems of Peace

ON the morrow of victory, manifold problems clamour for solution. Unforeseen difficulties arise. The dislocations of the return to peace are felt acutely in every phase of civilian life, as well as amongst the forces. The ending of world war in victory, the new democratic awakening in Europe and the electoral triumph in Britain are the substantial basis on which to build the future: but the work is not going to be easy. The most destructive war in history has left behind it problems only less great than war itself. The people of Britain, though relieved now of pressing anxieties and justly confident of their future, will yet have to maintain for a long while ahead the noble tension which sustained them through the years of war.

A Salutary Shock

In the very opening of the new epoch came the announcement by President Truman that Lease-Lend had ended. Though greeted with ill-concealed joy as a sprag in the Labour wheels by voices of reaction (who thereby revealed how *they* would have used it, had the Tories won, to drop their election promises) the announcement nevertheless was a salutary shock. It prevented any intoxication of victory; it brought a realisation of the manifold problems that confront the British people and their new parliament; and it showed the necessity for new thinking on the arising issues of the new epoch. So far from the Philistine assumption of "put on the brakes" being warranted, careful thinking may disclose the need for a greater speed of social advance than was contemplated at the time of the King's Speech in mid-August. Just as the servicemen's grievances have to be met by a speeding-up of demobilisation, so the many other unforeseen difficulties of this period may demand for their solution not a slower, but a faster pace in far-reaching change than was foreseen in plans laid down in summer-time. Moreover, it is just in these autumn and winter months that the new parliament has to set its course and to vindicate the many hopes reposed in it by the people—as against those who already prophesy a repetition of the follow-up of the last great "electoral landslide" when the 1906 parliament, under a Cabinet "mistrusting its own Left" disappointed the masses and brought about a wave of disillusionment, resulting, within a few years, in syndicalism on the one hand and partial Tory recovery on the other. Already members of parliament are hearing from their service and civilian constituents of grievances urgently requiring remedy. Much is expected from the new parliament: and a heavy responsibility falls on the Labour majority to grapple boldly with the difficulties and so maintain the trust and united support of the masses in their elected representatives.

Trades Union Congress

That this united support is assured to a bold policy was made abundantly clear by the discussions and decisions of the Trades Union Congress. This 77th Congress at Blackpool in the second week of September marked a distinct advance, not only upon previous Congresses, but in the whole relative position of the British working-class following upon the part it played in the victory over fascism. The importance of the trade unions and their weight in the country was this time expressed clearly in the content of the main resolutions and in the high quality of the materials supplied to delegates, materials which deserve study in the workshops and trade union branches. The demand for the basic wage to tide

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over any period of "redundancy" and the resolution for improvement of the existing demobilisation scheme showed the Congress responsive to the difficulties of the immediate present: while in its plans for post-war industry, both as regards re-equipment and management and also in regard to wages and conditions of labour, the Congress formulated a fully-worked-out policy.

Support and Criticism

In its instructions to its General Council to examine the means of fitting shop stewards' committees into the older framework of trade unionism, the Congress again marked an advance. Shop stewards' committees, arising largely from the special conditions of the 1914-18 war (though arising partly as an adjustment then of workshop organisation to a trade unionism whose structural development had not kept pace with the change in industry) were regarded with considerable hostility in the Trades Union Congresses of those days. The shop steward committees have developed under different conditions in the last few years, have proved their worth also in connection with such new bodies as joint production committees, and are now realised as a potential strengthening of the traditional framework of the unions. Similarly on a whole series of home questions, ranging from women's pay ("the rate for the job") to the demand for a National Scientific Research Board, the Congress showed itself fully abreast of the needs of the moment. This gave all the more weight to the representations which it has put before the new Government. Of these some had arisen earlier during Churchill's "caretaker" administration: and no doubt there were some who would have counselled their withdrawal to avoid "embarrassing" the Labour administration. The Congress voiced the true spirit of trade unionism when it rejected any such tactics and proclaimed its attitude to the Labour Government as one of full support combined with fearless criticism.

New Responsibilities

It is this attitude, which, if maintained and carried throughout the workshops and trade union branches, will enable the working-class and the British people as a whole to solve their manifold problems with sureness and speed. But this attitude brings with it an obligation to devote the most serious thought to the new problems in all the organs of the movement. In the press organs, particularly, there is need for the development of a greater sense of responsibility in this matter (the American delegate's diatribe, received with much impatient dissent by the Congress, was fulsomely echoed in the *Daily Herald*!) while the various weekly periodicals, with the exception of *Reynolds*, are now carrying much less weight of metal than some of their reactionary opponents. In the trade unions themselves, however, as shown by the speeches of Congress delegates, there was, with one or two exceptions, a growing recognition of the new responsibilities that must be assumed following on the victory over fascism and the election of the new parliament. Particularly was this shown in the discussion on mines, as also in the subsequent manifesto by the National Union of Mineworkers. Nationalisation of mines is seen as the fulfilment of a trade union demand persisted in for over fifty years and for half that period in the forefront of every Labour programme. The supply of coal is seen as perhaps of all the material shortages the most vital alike for Britain and for Europe. The appointment of Arthur Horner, whose speech was greeted with close attention by Congress delegates, as national agent for the coal production campaign (in which capacity he has written a special article in this number) is an earnest of the changed relations in industry which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an advance towards socialism makes possible.

External Policy

All these internal problems are closely bound up with external policy —which was, not altogether surprisingly, the weakest side of this Trades Union Congress, just as it has also so far been the least satisfactory aspect of the new administration. The linkage between external and internal problems is seen most obviously in the specially difficult questions of Anglo-American relations following on the surcease of Lease-Lend and in the difficulties (dealt with by Maurice Dobb in this number) of United Kingdom imports and exports. But the linkage goes far wider. If, for the sake of iron ore and oranges (and on the ground that it is not formally "trading with the enemy") close economic relations with fascist Spain are developed; then not only is Franco strengthened, but what should be the first purpose of foreign policy—"to root out every vestige of fascism"—is thereby frustrated. Similarly, ever friendlier ties both political and economic with the new democracies in Europe not only help in the extirpation of fascism there, but strengthen democracy in Britain. The rooting out of fascism, the growth of economic co-operation internationally and the development of democracy in each country are paramount aims of any foreign policy that is not to sink back into the slough of despond. But the condition for the fulfilment of these aims is the maximum unity of the chief powers. That unity, as well as these three paramount aims, are threatened equally (as is shown by the articles of W. Rust and A. Clegg) by Western bloc schemes and propaganda, and by refusal or reluctance in the East to meet the demands of the liberated peoples.

Democracies "Unrecognised"

A cloudy attempt is being made in various journals to "explain" the present new democracies of the Danube valley as "totalitarian" and their anti-fascist governments as therefore unrecognisable by Britain and the United States. Moreover, not only are the existing Governments (Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary) not to be recognised but, according to a British Foreign Office statement, no Government resulting from the forthcoming general elections in Bulgaria under the new electoral laws would be recognised. It would be worth while at a later date, to examine the "theoretical" arguments by which this standpoint is supported. But for the moment it is only necessary to recall certain plain facts which are seldom mentioned in the newspaper discussions in the case, for example, of Rumania.

Old Rumania

Throughout the short sixty years of its existence as an independent kingdom up to the declaration of war upon the United Nations, Rumania had never enjoyed a truly democratic regime. Its Hohenzollern monarch in the ten years preceding the entry into the war was Carol (whose private life became fairly well known to readers of Sunday newspapers) and under him the country was plundered. The Rumanian oil wells were largely held by subsidiaries of the giant international oil trusts, viz., Standard Oil and Royal-Dutch Shell. Under similar conditions in Latin America "revolutions," engineered from outside, were frequent in the first part of this century. In Rumania, apart from the "Iron Guard" and other fascist organisations, the two main political parties looked largely to outside interests for their support, while a reign of terror effectively prevented the free functioning of working-class and peasant bodies. Thus the dictatorship of Antonescu from 1940 onwards as Hitler's puppet encountered no serious obstacles amongst the corrupt ruling circles of Rumania, nor amongst such politicians

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as Maniu (leader of the National Zaranist Party, which claimed to represent the richer peasants) nor Bratianu (leader of the National Liberal Party, which was uniformly favourable to foreign capitalist interests). Indeed, a year and a half before the outbreak of the war, Maniu took occasion to praise Mussolini and Hitler as examples. "Hitler," said Maniu on December 1, 1937, "saved his country from certain dangerous tendencies," while of the Duce and the Fuehrer together he said "their deeds have eloquently justified their appearance and they are worthy of our admiration."

New Rumania

With the fall of Antonescu in the autumn of 1944 and the defeat of the satellite Rumanian forces by the Red Army, the process began for the first time of democracy coming to birth in Rumania. But that process, hindered for six months by transitional governmen s backed by the reactionaries of Maniu's Party, only got under way in the spring of this year when a Government was formed by Peter Groza, leader of a peasant party, and based upon the National Democratic Front (itself composed of the federated trade unions, the Social Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the Patriotic Union and others). The Government does not include adherents of Maniu and Bratianu, who had asked a greater share in the Cabinet than they were entitled to by the strength of their following. The new Government in these last six months has several democratic achievements to its credit, including the fulfilment of the Allied Armistice terms, a widespread agrarian reform, the establishment of conditions favourable for the growth of trade unionism and the settlement of the vexed question in Transylvania. Under these circumstances, the refusal of recognition to this Groza cabinet calls for some explanation: and any explanation given should not omit the activities of the oil trusts and any representations made by them to the State Department of the U.S.A. or to Foreign Office circles.

The Need for Unity

This is but one example of the difficulties and complexities, in this case inherited from the previous Government, which beset the labour movement at the present time. There is no need to think that this or any similar problem is insoluble, or that mistakes made by a Labour Government, or by any other Government, cannot be remedied. But it does powerfully reinforce the need of the attitude laid down at the Trades Union Congress: and that attitude of support (combined where need be with criticism) can be effective against all the insidious operations of Tory influence and Tory malice to the extent that it represents a united movement. Given the maximum unity in the working-class, then the manifold problems of this immediate post-war period can be overcome. Just for this reason the need for widespread democratic discussion and new ways of approach as urged in these notes, must be accompanied by continuous and unrelaxing effort for the unity and strengthening of the Labour Party and of the labour movement as a whole. Within a few weeks the municipal elections will bring a testing milestone: and for them a remobilisation is wanted to ensure that the policy voted for at the General Election is guaranteed locally also. In this every section of the movement, and not least the Communists, have an essential part to play.

R. P. A.

Sept. 22, 1945.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coal Situation in Great Britain

by ARTHUR HORNER

THERE is one question about which there is no difference in any quarter and that is, the coal supply in this country. Everyone competent to know agrees that the situation is critical and even dangerous. With an annual output of 184 million tons per year as against a minimum requirement of 200 million tons, one is entitled to be alarmed. The minimum necessary to meet the country's needs at home and abroad amounts to at least 250 million tons per annum. Under existing conditions, however, only an annual production of 200 million tons is feasible.

The present production is barely sufficient to meet essential internal needs: here are examples taken from Mr. Shinwell's speech at Cardiff of our vanishing reserves in electricity, gas and other industries:—

The situation is more serious this winter than it has ever been. *Stocks July 27th*, 1945.

Coal for Gas, 3 weeks' supply as against 6 weeks' supply last year.

Coal for Electricity, 6 weeks' supply as against 7 weeks' supply last year.

Coal for Railways, 1 week's supply as against 3 weeks' supply last year.

The supply of coal for domestic and industrial use is equally as bad.

It is estimated that we have lost 5,000,000 tons of coal during the Annual and VJ day holidays. To meet the minimum needs we want an extra 8,000,000 tons in the next 6 months.

This narrow margin presents alarming possibilities. Transport breakdowns due to weather or other causes, mine accidents, etc., could produce a situation which in the course of days would involve serious interference with supplies for domestic purposes, to the gas and electricity undertakings, to factories and steel works, and especially to railways.

The position with regard to supplies of gas and locomotive coal is especially important because, should rail transport fail or be impeded through lack of fuel, it would further impede coal production by preventing the necessary supplies of waggons to take the coal away from the collieries.

This description of the situation does not take into account the consequences of the speedy demobilisation and employment of millions of men and women now in the armed forces. When they return it is extremely important that they shall be provided with remunerative employment in British industry. Unless they are, grave discontent will arise which can express itself in dangerous forms. Apart, however, from the fear of consequences it is elementary justice that the country for which these gallant people have fought, shall give them an honourable and secure place in its social life. If coal production remains unchanged then it is impossible for British industry to expand sufficiently to absorb them.

The requirements of the export trade are in addition to the foregoing. There is great clamour in the coal-impoverished countries of Europe for British coal. It is in the interests of the British people that our exports should be rapidly increased so as to enable payments to be made for the imports which we must receive if we are to maintain the present standard of living of the British people, including the mining community.

The economic difficulties of the country have been aggravated by the cessation of Lease-Lend. We are now forced into the position that apart from the possibility of a loan from the U.S.A. we shall be compelled in future to export commodities equal in value to those we require to import.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is necessary to point out, however, that the situation in those countries of Europe which have been under German occupation is critical and that this situation is being largely contributed to by the almost complete absence of coal imports. In countries such as France, Holland, Norway and Belgium, as well as in Italy, millions of people could be placed in useful employment if coal was available to make possible reasonably efficient running of the railways and the functioning of factories. Instead of these willing workers being given an opportunity to produce commodities they need for themselves and this, in turn, causing them to clamour for the importation of manufactured articles, they are compelled to remain idle under conditions of destitution and suffering.

It is not an exaggeration to state that unless some amelioration is found for this condition, that disease and death will affect millions of people in the continent of Europe during the coming winter; and we must not ignore the possibility that diseases may find their way across the channel, invading this island with even more dire consequences than those which arose from the influenza epidemic which followed the last war.

Amongst the people who are now called upon to suffer are those so-called "displaced persons" who were forcibly sent to Germany to work on starvation earnings, and the resistance fighters who fought with their bare hands in the hills and valleys of their countries against the well-armed forces of Germany and her allies. They have no reserve of energy, it was all used up during those years of war and occupation and it is beyond the possibility of human beings to exist in reasonable health under conditions of starvation as they have been compelled to do up to now—especially when the winter comes and no means are available to provide their starved bodies with external warmth which alone might save them from death.

The Coming of the Labour Government

It is in this tremendously difficult situation that the Labour Government with a decisive majority has taken over the reins of authority in Britain for the first time in British history. The struggle to create an independent working-class political party capable of taking over the reins of government has been essentially the affair of the British mining community. It is from the ranks of the miners that the pioneers of independent working-class politics emerged. It is largely as a result of the votes cast for Labour in the mining areas that the present Labour Government has come into being. It is not surprising that the driving force in this respect should have emanated from the ranks of the mining community. The history of mining people under all previous regimes has been the record of extreme exploitation of the miners and their families for nearly 200 years, notwithstanding the fact that mineworkers have until this day been called upon to perform the most difficult, dirty, drab and dangerous work of all.

The miners were compelled, in order to find easement from the measures of exploitation practised against them, to use every opportunity and every means to destroy the power of their exploiters expressed through reactionary governments and especially to destroy the Tory rule.

Tory rule has always meant that in every crisis in the coal industry, in every struggle in which the miners have been engaged with the mineowners, the weight of the government apparatus has been thrown into the balance on the side of the mineowners and in most cases it has determined the defeat of the miners, oftentimes after months of struggle which have caused undue suffering to the women

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and children who are the dependants of the miners themselves.

The fight for a Labour Government for the mining community therefore was, in fact, one to secure the support of governmental authority to help solve the general difficulties of the British working-class and especially to limit the degradation of the mining community.

The miners have been compelled to depend more and more upon parliamentary means brought into operation by the weight of industrial pressure to secure the minimum and fundamental conditions in the coal industry. Hours of work are limited by law; and safety regulations, of tremendous importance in an industry in which one in four of the total manpower is injured every year and when approximately 1,000 per annum are killed by an industrial disease, are laid down in Acts of Parliament. The Minimum Wage Act of 1912 fixed a basis to the meagre earnings of the men in this industry; while Workmen's Compensation has only been raised to its present inadequate levels as a result of legislation.

It should be appreciated by all, the miners in particular, that this experiment in Labour rule will depend for its success upon the ability of this Labour Government to solve the economic problems which confront the British people. The test of success of the Labour Government will be determined by whether it can provide a planned economy which will ensure full employment, decent wage-standard, satisfactory housing conditions and security through social insurance. The responsibility upon the mining community is therefore exceedingly great; *because if there is failure to provide sufficient coal to get through this winter, the Labour Government will fail in its plans; and if this Government fails, then the mining community will be confronted by a greater disaster than we have ever been called upon to suffer under before.*

The Government has given firm pledges, both in the King's Speech and to representatives of the National Union of Mineworkers, that a Bill for the nationalisation of the coal mining industry will be placed before Parliament during this year; and it is expected that this long-called-for enactment will be in operation during the summer of 1946.

The transference of the mining industry from private to public ownership is not a simple act; it is a process and it has already begun. The success or otherwise in our immediate efforts during the transition period to nationalisation will largely determine whether our claims for nationalisation have been justified.

The method to be applied is not that of confiscation but of purchase. There are those who, like myself, in the past have opposed this method, but who in face of present circumstances, must place the question of purchase *v.* confiscation, in its proper perspective. Mr. Shinwell is correct; it is not the fact that the mines are purchased, or the amount which is paid for them that is important. The overwhelming consideration must be to make the mines the nation's property as promptly as possible. In this situation it is not profitable, therefore, to allow quibbles to arise which would probably lead to delays and to the postponement of the realisation of the main aim. Many people are anxious to know what results were expected from the nationalisation of the industry. Our reply is, that we hope and believe that the unification of the industry which is inherent in nationalisation will lead to the possibility of much higher efficiency in the organisation of the industry. Technical measures to make the industry efficient are already provided for us in the Reid plan; and if the authority yet to be appointed to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carry on the industry on behalf of the State does its job, these measures will be applied with extreme rapidity following its establishment. The pooling of supplies and of equipment, co-ordination in the sale of coal, etc., should enable great economies to be brought about. From these factors we expect highly increased output per man-shift, not as a result of greater expenditure of human energy, but as a consequence of technical improvements. It should make possible the termination of the most laborious and monotonous work in the miners' daily toil. From this increased output, whilst selling coal at reasonable prices, we expect to have available the means to realise many of the reforms for which we have long struggled. If our plans—both the short-term and the long-term plans—can be realised, then within a limited period, the following reforms should be in operation:—

1. Five-day week with six-days' pay.
2. Three weeks' holiday with pay.
3. Subsidiary pensions for miners at 55 years of age.
4. Adequate training schemes and proper conditions for entrants into the mines.
5. Improved medical service.
6. Better safety conditions.
7. Higher social amenities including housing, pithead baths, etc.

These do not represent the totality of our expectations from nationalisation, especially because we have in view the payment of wages to mineworkers which shall keep them in the first rank of all industries, not only because of the danger in which they work, but as well because of the new skill they will be called upon to exercise under the new conditions, which will make them highly-skilled users of machines.

The Immediate Task

There is considerable misunderstanding amongst the population generally as to why we are faced with this coal shortage. Ill-informed critics, as well as certain coal owners' publicists, have caused many to believe that it is due, in the main, to sullen resentment on the part of the miners, which has been expressed in a refusal to do their duty by the country under conditions of war. This picture is completely false. It has been established after most careful consideration by both the Mine-Owners Association and the National Union of Mineworkers that whereas in 1939 there were 766,300 men in the industry, in 1941 this number had been reduced to 697,300. This, it is agreed, represents a loss of 40 million tons per annum. What is not, however, sufficiently well known is, that the men who remained in the industry by more regular working in war-years than in pre-war years, made up 15 million tons, thus reducing the loss due to manpower to 25 million tons. It is true that from 1942 to 1944 a further loss of 22 million tons per annum occurred. This loss can be explained by the inadequate feeding of mineworkers, having regard to the heavy nature of their employment, by exhaustion after years of war, during which they were compelled to work under blackout conditions by day and live under blackout conditions by night in isolated and drab villages, cut off through lack of transport, from all social amenities available to other people.

At the present time, of the 710,000 employees in the industry, over 100,000 are over 55 years of age. This may not be an important factor in the opinion of those employed in light or sedentary work, but it is of the most serious consideration when regard is had to the fact that these men have to work exceedingly hard in limited spaces with totally inadequate illumination in artificial atmospheres, frequently heavily laden with deadly dusts which have disabled so many

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousands in recent years. Besides all these, more than 40,000 new entrants have been directed into the industry, only a minority of whom have been willing to come into it. The great majority of the so-called Bevin Boys did not desire to enter the mining industry, they do not intend to remain in it and unfortunately only relatively few have considered it worth the trouble to learn the highly-skilled trade of mining. This depleted and exhausted labour has been compelled to work oftentimes with unsatisfactory machinery, especially with the belting necessary for the conveyors. The loss of Burma, which involved the necessity to resort to the production of synthetic rubber, has created many difficulties in the mining industry; these difficulties, although unavoidable, have nevertheless resulted in the loss of considerable coal output, especially during the latter years of the war. This, and other factors, too numerous to mention, have all made their due contribution to the deterioration which has placed the industry in its present deplorable condition.

The problem now is to improve the output of coal notwithstanding these difficulties and to do so immediately to meet the country's urgent needs. The problem would be simple of solution if increased manpower was likely to be available either from the ranks of demobilised service men, or, from ex-mineworkers who have taken up employment in other war industries.

Up to the present, however, there is little evidence to show that during the coming six months we shall be able to secure new entrants to compensate for the loss of approximately 20,000 which we shall suffer in this period, due to injury, disease, death, ill-health, or other causes. The increase in the industrial manpower remains the only satisfactory solution to the immediate problem of coal production. There should be complete appreciation of this situation amongst the non-mining community, for it is impossible for any honest person to justify criticism of men who are called upon to work in an industry into which the critics are not prepared to enter.

In spite, however, of all the difficulties, the National Union of Mineworkers has decided that it is possible to satisfy the request of the Ministry of Fuel and Power by bringing about an increase in production of eight million tons in the coming six months. This can only be achieved if there is an entirely new approach to mineworkers and their problems. Basing ourselves on the class-consciousness of the mining community and its responsibility for the existence of a Labour Government, we are calling for the co-operation of men and management in this common endeavour. It is not a call to overwrought men to work harder or longer. It is, however, an appeal that they shall, out of the wealth of their experience and their knowledge, now unleash their undoubted inventive capacity and initiative in discovering better ways of working which will give the results required.

The first essential to success is the winning of the miners into a realisation that in so-doing they will benefit the working-class generally and especially, that, at long last, recognition will come to the miners in practical form which will have a relation to the service which they rendered to the country. Upon this solid foundation of class-solidarity, we justify our hopes for the success of the future work of different and revivified pit production committees.

These committees will have a new authority, they will be assured that they will no longer be frustrated or ignored by contempt of their proposals. The situation for the managerial and supervisory staffs has fundamentally changed and managers will, I

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hope, now appreciate that their chances of promotion will in future depend solely upon their ability to work with the men in a united endeavour to give the best results with due regard to safety. In the past they have not been free to exercise their judgments, but have been frequently compelled to subordinate their energy and experience to the purposes of higher policy which had more concern with finance than with genuine economics.

Managers and those under them in supervisory positions have been given a clear assurance from the National Union of Mineworkers that it is not the intention to reduce their status and authority. Whilst a pit is working, the manager of a mine will be as responsible and authoritative as the captain of a ship at sea. However, before or after the termination of a shift, managers in future must be willing to examine and give serious consideration to what the men's representatives have to say and to submit to criticism if it is considered that mistakes have been made, intentional or otherwise. In other words, the manpower of the industry, which must of necessity include managers and supervisors, as well as workmen, and both must now realise that they can no longer afford to regard each other as enemies, but rather as servants of the State called upon to undertake vital services on its behalf.

This new relationship should make for maximum success, expressed in the working of the pit production committees. Various disputes have in the past resulted ostensibly out of differences over farthings, when they have, in fact, been expressions of the antipathy which has always existed between the supervisory staff and the workmen. This must now be brought to an end, and the coal thus saved will represent a considerable and appreciable contribution towards the eight million additional tons required.

To ensure that workmen's representatives on pit production committees are not frustrated, area production officers employed by the National Union of Mineworkers have been appointed in every district. It will be for these men working in close conjunction with the regional officer of the Ministry of Fuel and Power to ensure that every feasible idea which might help in increasing production is examined. It will be their business to resolve differences as to methods to be employed in the daily working of the mines. It should be made clear, however, that it is not the intention that district production officers should attempt to become substitutes for pit production committees; they never can in fact be that. The intention is that they shall be guides, protectors and friends, having regard all the time to the purpose for which they have been elected. The pit production officers in the district will be working under the control of regional or district production committees composed of experienced trade unionists and this should ensure the maximum value being got from their employment.

At the centre it has been determined to appoint a national service officer and that responsibility has been placed upon my shoulders. In the same way as in the regions, I work under the direction of a committee composed of highly experienced representatives, especially from the big producing areas of the British coalfields. This committee is answerable to the executive committee of the National Union of Mineworkers. We are simply agents to carry out the tasks which we believe in and which were set by us in order to achieve the aims set out in this article. It is our intention, through mass meetings and literature to explain in the greatest detail why we have under-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taken this extremely difficult task. We have done so because we are certain that when our members appreciate the nature of the issues which are at stake, when they understand that the future of our country and of all humanity can be affected by our success or our failure, they will, out of their deep sense of class loyalty, and because of their great pioneering faith, draw forth reserves of inventive genius and initiative based upon their experience, which will give continuity to the life of the Labour Government, because we shall have enabled the Government to fulfil its pledges to the people and thereby ensure prosperity and peace for all.

The Economic Situation and Labour Policy

by MAURICE DOBB

IT is a commonplace to say that underlying the world economic situation to-day is the fact that America, on the one hand, has emerged from the war with greatly increased productive power, while over nearly the whole continent of Europe, on the other hand, productive power has been greatly reduced, if not crippled, by the war. While Europe's agriculture has been so largely devastated by the war (particularly the equipment of agriculture, such as machinery and livestock), in other parts of the world agricultural surpluses have often remained unsold for lack of shipping to overseas markets, and in some cases have been bought and destroyed to prevent their falling into enemy hands. Thus, what Lenin termed the "inequality of development of capitalism" has been greatly increased, both on a world scale and inside particular countries; and disproportions in the realm of production and in the sphere of trade have been greatly accentuated.

Superficially this situation bears a good deal of resemblance to the situation after the last war; and some might be tempted by this resemblance to suppose that the same cycle of events as occurred after 1918 would inevitably repeat themselves. But not only are the economic disproportions confronting us today so much greater than ever before as to introduce certain important difference of kind into the situation, but the whole balance of power in the world, and in particular the balance of class forces, has radically shifted as a result of war. Stress on resemblances with the last can, therefore, be positively misleading if it leads to a substitution of "the learning and repetition by rote of 'formulas'" for "an analysis of the concrete peculiarities" of the present "historical moment."

As far as this country is concerned, it shares with America a considerable increase of productive power in all those branches of industry that have been connected with war-production. But unlike America, its consumer-goods industries have been sharply contracted in the course of the war; raw material supplies for these industries coming from overseas have been curtailed and remain curtailed; and as a result of war-time dislocations (piled on previous inefficiency) industries such as coal and building have much leeway to make up. While civilian consumption per head in U.S.A. is 10 to 15 per cent. *above* the 1939 level, civilian consumption per head in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain has *fallen* by 15 to 20 per cent.* Not only has the output of consumption goods been contracted over the past six years, in order to release manpower, shipping-space and sometimes factory space (where this was adaptable) for war-production; but our export industries have also been cut to the bone, in the interests of maximum war production; imports being financed by mortgaging overseas investments and by American Lend-Lease. Not only does an immense problem of transference of labour and re-equipment—of retooling war factories and restarting and and re-equipping the civilian goods in industries—confront this country in the next two years, before the means for reconstruction and a higher standard of life can be forthcoming, but also a problem of finding the means to pay for essential imports of food and raw materials by expanding production for export and finding enlarged export markets. In these respects, the economic problem of Britain resembles that of the liberated countries on the continent of Europe.

This aspect of Britain's economic problem—her large dependence on import from abroad for certain essential raw materials like cotton, certain metals including iron ore, timber and paper pulp, oil, tobacco, and a considerable range of foodstuffs and animal feeding stuffs—has been brought sharply to our attention by President Truman's announcement of the abrupt termination of Lend-Lease supplies. Our trade balance position at present is that we are exporting at the rate of about £350 millions a year; which is about three-quarters of pre-war exports in *value* and about two-fifths of pre-war in *volume* (since average export prices have risen). We have been importing at the rate of about £1,300 million excluding munitions.* This latter figure represents an increase of about a half over pre-war. But the increase is more than accounted for by a rise of price of the things we have been purchasing abroad; this rise, probably amounting to about 80 per cent., and the actual *volume* of non-munitions imports amounting to no more than some four-fifths of pre-war.

This swollen gap between imports and exports†—between national purchases and national sales—has been covered so far as munition-imports are concerned by Lend-Lease; and as far as the surplus of non-munitions imports is concerned by reciprocal purchases made by Americans in this country (including the so-called Reverse Lend-Lease) and by the accumulation of sterling balances in London to the account of Empire countries. The latter represent goods bought from Empire countries and paid for by crediting these countries with a balance in London for future use. About £500 million of imports per annum have probably been paid for in this way; and these sterling balances probably total something over £3,000 million.

There are, however, certain factors in the situation which make the trade balance outlook less black than some people like Mr. Lyttelton are trying to make out, and less serious even than Mr. Attlee's recent statement

* Statement of Sir Stafford Cripps to Lancs. and Cheshire Federation of Trade Councils, Sept. 9, 1945. The figures relate to 1944.

* The figure of £2,000 million cited by Mr. Attlee in the House of Commons was of *expenditure* abroad; and apparently included some £600 million on military expenditure overseas and a debit balance of about £100 million on "invisible" items like shipping.

† Estimates of T. Barna in London and Cambridge Econ. Service Memo. No. 101, pp. 7-9. Most of this price-rise of imports was due to the rise in prices abroad, especially American prices, and to a smaller extent to the depreciation of the exchange rate of sterling.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

implied. Munitions purchases from abroad can, of course, be expected to come to an end with the termination of the war; as can also military expenditure overseas (e.g., in the Far East). But it seems also likely that a further cut of about £300 million of non-munitions imports could quickly be made; these imports representing the raw materials of war industry in this country, although not actually classified as munitions of war. Moreover, it is probable that we shall be able in future to buy our imports more cheaply than we have done in the last few years, and this in two ways. Firstly, the shipping bottleneck during the war has compelled a substitution wherever possible of less bulky and dearer goods for the more bulky but cheaper (e.g., finished or semi-finished metals for ores); and with an easing of the shipping position it should become possible once again to opt in many cases for the bulky but cheap commodities. Secondly, the proportion of our imports which we have obtained from U.S.A. has grown enormously since the war (from about 13 per cent. of the whole to about 60 per cent. in both value and volume), and prices of American exports have apparently risen very much more steeply than the prices of exports from British Empire countries.* In so far as purchases from the latter can be substituted for purchases from U.S.A., the same quantities of imports will be obtainable at a smaller value. However, there are limits to the possibility of such substitution. Countries of the British Empire are, as a whole, short of cotton, tobacco and oil; and even before the war Britain relied for nearly half of its cotton, four-fifths of its tobacco and a half of its machinery imports on U.S.A. Any idea of a closed "sterling bloc," such as some advocate, will not square with the facts of our import needs.

* Barna, *loc. cit.*, p. 7.

At the same time, one has to remember that full employment and a higher standard of life in this country will mean that we shall require more from abroad, at least of certain things. Larger working-class incomes will mean a larger demand for things like tobacco, fruit, imported meat and dairy produce (although this may be *partly* off-set by a reduction in luxury imports such as wines, if higher incomes are taxed progressively). Full capacity working in textiles will mean a larger import of cotton, and a high output of machinery for re-equipment may mean a larger import of iron ore and other metals. The problem of the sterling balances may prove actually a more difficult problem than the Anglo-American balance; since a claim that these balances should be unblocked and be spent (and India is at present clamouring, with reason, for permission to spend hers) would mean either a sharp worsening of our balance of payments with America (if these sterling-balances were changed into dollars and spent in America) or else an earmarking of British export-goods to meet these claims without the receipt by this country of any equivalent in return. The problem of organising and expanding the export trade remains a very important one for this country; and if exports are to be doubled or trebled over their present amount, it may not be possible to maintain the high price-level at which the diminished quantity of exports has been able to find a sale in war-time conditions.

This export problem has two aspects. One is that of reorganising the industries capable of producing for export markets so as to increase the productivity of labour and cheapen the cost at which such commodities can be produced and sold. So much has recently been said and written about the inefficient equipment and organisation of leading industries in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this country, and about the urgent need for reorganisation, that little more need be said about this here. Until such reorganisation can be undertaken, however, an enlargement of supplies for export must necessarily be at the expense of what could otherwise be made available at home for purposes of reconstruction and higher consumption. In the engineering industry there has been a big improvement in equipment, standardised production, etc., in war-time, much of which can probably be adapted fairly soon to peace-time purposes, given the necessary energy in planning, in forward bulk-contracts from the government, and the breaking of any monopolistic tendencies towards restriction on productive capacity.

The other aspect is that of accelerating reconstruction abroad, and raising the purchasing power of other countries, so that they will be in a position to buy the goods that British industry is able to supply for export. In other words, the possibilities of a successful expansionist policy at home in part depend on the possibility of a successful expansionist policy abroad. This possibility is, of course, severely limited by economic rivalries, the restrictive activities of monopolistic interests, and by the planlessness of a capitalist world. But the possibilities are nevertheless greater than they ever were before. The problem which the famous Bretton Woods Conference sought to tackle was one of expanding the volume of international trade by the double provision of a new international (''multilateral'') monetary system and of providing means by which the needs of the poorer countries could be financed so as to enable them to expand their trade-turnover. In this connection, America with her rich productive capacity holds a key position; and it has been repeatedly emphasised that only if she is willing to give credits on a large scale to enable other countries to purchase, and at the same time expand her own imports of goods that these other countries can offer (by lowering her own tariffs and pursuing an expansionist policy at home), can the Bretton Woods schemes of economic co-operation have any chance of success. The alternative is the formation of a number of rival ''autarkic'' trade-and-currency blocs and a reversion to cut-throat export wars such as throttled international exchange in the 1930's.

Evidently, as President Truman's recent speech indicates, a certain section of American capitalism favours an expansionist credit and loan-policy towards other countries as a contribution to full employment in American export industries. At the same time there are indications that the grant of credit-facilities will be used as a bargaining counter to secure a removal of any trade restrictions (e.g., the Ottawa system of imperial preference) and exchange controls which stand in the way of American dominance of other markets. Moreover, there is no present indication of America expanding her own purchases from other countries (e.g., by tariff reductions), which is a necessary reciprocal condition of expanding trade relations between America, the country of high industrial capacity, and the impoverished or more backward nations of other continents. Indeed, any proposal to do so (except as an accompaniment of a very big expansion in the American home market) would obviously meet powerful opposition from sections of American business.

The economic problem confronting the Labour Government of this country during the transition between war and peace will not, therefore, be an easy one. It is one that needs careful explaining in its simple essentials, to the mass of the people in this country, in order that there may be the maxi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mum of national unity in the tackling of these problems, and that reactionary attempts to stampede people by demagogic stunts may the better be resisted. A campaign of propaganda and education in this sense is as necessary now as similar propaganda was during the war.

The economic situation will also require the maximum of understanding, co-operation and democratic initiative from the trade union and workshop movement. At the same time it is evident that, if we are to avoid a repetition of the 1920-story, firm and resolute planning of a kind and on a scale never previously seen in this country is essential: a fact which many capitalists themselves realise, much as they distrust State planning and control (unless they can dominate it entirely). The economic problem confronting us may be a difficult one; but given the will and determination to carry out the policy outlined in *Let Us Face the Future* to the full, there is no ground at all for defeatism. Quite the contrary: if the coalition of the United Nations in war continues into the peace, it should be possible for the United Nations to achieve at least a minimum programme of economic co-operation such as will enable Europe to restore its shattered economic structure and to switch over from war to peace; will permit an expansion of international trade and avoid a relapse into cut-throat export wars on a shrunken market.

Even so, in the economic plan that is urgently needed to steer the readjustment process in the coming year expanded production for export must have an important (though not a disproportionate) place. This plan must be constructed according to a scale of priorities and be worked out in terms of regions as well as industries; and requires first and foremost to be a plan of man-power priorities to guide demobilisation and labour allocation: a plan which should be made public and widely popularised. The speediest possible *tempo* of demobilisation is needed, not only in fairness to the serviceman, but because of the urgent demands of production for the home market, for building and reconstruction, and for export, and the economic loss entailed in allowing "uniformed unemployment" (as it was called at the T.U.C.) to continue for a week longer than is necessary. Plans for stepping-up normal peace-time production, as man-power becomes available, and similar plans for the re-equipment of industries like coal and textiles, will need to be co-ordinated with a plan of import priorities and an export-plan to furnish the means of paying for these imports.

As regards economic relations with other countries: it is obvious that during this period of readjustment and re-equipment the retention, not only of wartime exchange-control, but of control of imports and exports, will be essential. It is probably also desirable to retain for the present the right to restrict the import of certain commodities that we need to countries that are willing to take British export goods in exchange on favourable terms: at least, to retain this right until American intentions are clearer and measures of economic co-operation on an international scale are at a more advanced stage.

In the meantime, both bulk government purchases abroad, with government controlled allocation of these imports at home according to a considered scale of priorities, and government controlled allocation of orders for export among home industries could probably play an important role; just as bulk purchases of building materials and industrial equipment and the extension of schemes of "utility production" in the home market could do much both to en-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

courage standardisation, thereby cheapening costs and facilitating control of profit-margins and prices, and also to ensure the carrying out in practice of the economic plan of social priorities.

One fact in the situation is crucial and needs to be understood: increase in *real* income for the mass of the people will become possible in the degree that the production of consumer goods (and the possibilities of import, which in turn are conditioned by production for export) is increased. Until such time as this production has been sufficiently increased, it will be necessary to retain both price-controls and controlled-distribution through rationing. The money-wage policy of trade unionism in the new period in front of us will not only have to be yoked with a policy of price- and profit-control, but will need to be geared to a production policy as well.

Western Bloc

by WILLIAM RUST

THE ending of the world war has pushed foreign policy questions to the foreground. The accumulated issues of years have now to be solved, peace treaties have to be framed, new frontiers drawn and frontier disputes settled, and the future of the former colonies of the defeated enemy decided. It is the declared intention of the United Nations to settle all these questions within the framework of world political and economic co-operation.

The success so far achieved in carrying the policy of world democratic co-operation into the peace has been shown by the decisions of the San Francisco Conference, which established the United Nations Organisation and of the Berlin Conference, which laid down the political and economic principles to govern the treatment of Germany.

The Berlin Conference also decided to set up a new piece of international machinery, namely, the Council of Foreign Ministers, which has since met in London and has established a permanent secretariat.

This progress is of deep significance, but it would be a mistake to disregard the existence of important disagreements and conflicts which the unanimity of international conferences often conceals. It is usually the case that issues on which agreement is difficult are postponed for future consideration. Moreover, it has also happened that agreed decisions have become the subject of sharp differences of interpretation and public controversy.

The differences between the Allies on Poland continued for many months despite the agreement reached at the Crimea Conference. The setting up of the Flensburg Government, fortunately short-lived, was in sharp contradiction to the spirit of the Crimea decisions on the German question.

The existence of such conflicts within the Allied camp is in no way surprising. They are an expression of imperialist rivalries and of concern for the strength of the Soviet Union and its wide international influence. But the general perspective remains one of continuing world co-operation between the victorious powers.

The Berlin Conference did not touch the question of Greece and it shelved a decision in the case of Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary. The meaning of this attitude was fairly clear at the time, namely, the differences between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Britain and U.S. on the other over the future of the new democratic regimes in the Balkans,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but these differences have since been linked with a much more serious issue, the Western bloc projected by prominent British and French politicians.

The British objections to the recognition of the Balkan Governments, although adorned with some flowery words uttered in devotion to democracy, are really an attempt to prevent the establishment of new popular regimes which mark the end of imperialist influences in Eastern Europe. Hence all the hullabaloo about the alleged undemocratic practices in these countries, although it must be said that the work of the governments concerned and the quiet preparations which are taking place in Bulgaria for the holding of elections contrast most sharply with the disorders and full prisons in Greece under British rule.

There is every reason why the Balkan question should be settled by agreement, as the Polish question before it. The setting up of real democratic sovereign states in Eastern Europe is a remarkable historical transformation which will clean up one of the most dangerous cockpits of war. The establishment of democracy in the Balkans can in no sense be regarded as the formation of an Eastern bloc, as is sometimes pretended, for the simple reason that the new governments are not engaged in the fostering of policies directed against the interests of other powers.

But the Western bloc, which is now being freely canvassed, is openly based on the concept that a closely co-ordinated grouping of Western powers (Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Italy and the Iberian Peninsula) is necessary on the threefold grounds of their geographical position, imperial interests and democratic way of life. This was the view put forward by General de Gaulle early in September, when he revived the Western bloc propaganda which has been the stock-in-trade of the reactionaries for many a long year.

There is but little difference between this concept and the discredited pre-war policies of East versus West which culminated in Munich, the betrayal of Czechoslovakia and the plunge into war. It can be seen in a twinkling of an eye that the Western bloc would be a substitute for the Berlin line of a united policy in Europe and that it would give encouragement to the reactionaries and fascists the world over.

Franco openly proclaimed this anti-Soviet aim in his letter to Churchill last October offering to include Spain in such a grouping.

The de Gaulle statement put forward the view that Western Europe is a geographical, economic, political and cultural fact, that the exportable surpluses of the countries concerned are mutually interchangeable and that the suggested grouping would be the best way of maintaining and developing the democratic contribution that Britain and France have always made to world affairs.

What is meant by these generalities?

Andre Philippe, the Socialist leader, has already made a concrete and extremely significant application of the de Gaulle plan. According to Philippe, the economic agreements between the countries of Western Europe should be increased to a military-customs alliance, and possibly very soon to a political federation. He writes:—

On the basis of a solid Anglo-French alliance a Western bloc can be formed which, together with the colonial empires of France, Belgium and the Netherlands, will be an adequate force to maintain relations on an equal basis with the two great powers of our epoch—the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.

Also, the *Daily Herald* has opened its columns to a fervent advocacy of the Western bloc by Leon Blum and that newspaper seems determined to trail its coat in front of the Soviet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union, as witness the leading articles denouncing that country as non-democratic and bewailing the inability of the Council of Foreign Ministers, where Soviet views carry great weight, to do more than redraw maps and reshuffle national allegiances.

On these writings of Philippe, *Pravda* made the acid comment that the cause of peace cannot be promoted by the propagating of blocs counterposed to international collaboration within the framework of the United Nations.

Similar comments have appeared in other organs of the Soviet Press, which is naturally critical of power groupings aimed at the isolation of the Soviet Union. Propaganda for such groupings arouses the hopes of reactionaries the world over and brings aid and comfort to the Munichеers, who, having learned nothing and forgotten nothing, are monstrously eager to return to their follies. Soviet resentment is fully justified by the sorely learned lessons of history.

Participation in a Western bloc would be against Britain's national interests, because this step would run counter to the principles of world co-operation and the indivisibility of peace adopted at San Francisco. Britain's influence in international affairs would be greatly weakened if she were to tread this path.

The abrupt ending of the Lend-Lease has faced Britain with acute problems which in the long run can be solved only on the basis of world economic co-operation. Participating in a bloc formed for the purpose of "talking tough" to the Soviet Union and the U.S. would hardly contribute to this solution, neither would it assist to strengthen democratic opinion in the U.S., which, in opposition to the Isolationists, is striving to carry through an enlightened economic policy which will side-step a new tariff war.

Moreover, to alienate Soviet sympathy at a moment of hard bargaining with the United States would scarcely be an act of wise statesmanship. Mr. Bevin would be better advised to take a leaf out of the book of the Foreign Minister of one of Europe's smaller states, namely, Christmas Moeller of Denmark, who, when asked for his opinion of a Western bloc, replied:—

> In my view Denmark's place is inside the framework of the United Nations, and neither Denmark nor any other northern country ought to enter into regional agreements. Denmark, as well as the other northern countries, must try to have the same good relations with the east as with the west.

The inability of the Labour Government so far to make a clean break with the reactionary trends in the foreign policy pursued by the National Government and its attempts to give some sort of ideological justification to its policy have led to stalemate in vital parts of Europe, to an encouragement of the pro-fascist forces and a resort to arguments which smell strongly of anti-Sovietism.

It is the undoubted desire of the Labour Party to see the establishment of a democratic Government in Greece, but Mr. Bevin still hesitates to take the plunge and continues to hold on to the puppet cabinet inherited from Mr. Churchill. It is true that Mr. Bevin has shut the door on the king's return rather more tightly than Mr. Churchill, but the essentials of the old policy remain—occupation of Greece by British troops and rule by non-representative Government.

Also, in Austria there is no progress to report. The U.S., France and the Soviet Union are ready to recognise the Provisional Government, which has been in existence since April. But as Britain still stands out against recognition, the deadlock is unsolved, with consequent further delay to the carrying through of the peace settlement in Eastern Europe.

Franco Spain, which was heavily pilloried in a separate declaration of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Berlin Conference, still enjoys full diplomatic relations with Britain, and the Spanish fascists have not concealed their joyous conclusion that the references in Bevin's first parliamentary speech on foreign policy to non-interference in Spanish affairs signify that the Potsdam statement is merely a rhetorical warning.

There is an obvious lack of consistency in the policies. Austria, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria are denied recognition on the grounds that their governments are insufficiently democratic. Greece is extended full recognition plus bountiful Unrra supplies, but denied the right to set up a democratic government. Fascist Spain continues to receive recognition on the grounds that withdrawal would be equivalent to intervention in its internal affairs.

The ideological arguments in support of these policies go to strange lengths in the *Daily Herald* and other papers.

Certainly, it would be wrong to exaggerate the importance of these wordy skirmishes, but they cannot be lightly dismissed. When differences exist they are bound to come out in various ways, although it is most surprising to find the Labour newspaper, which is virtually in the position of being the organ of the Government, making sweeping accusations against a great ally and resurrecting musty pre-war arguments which have long been discredited.

It should also be noted that various reactionary circles in Western Europe are quite openly propagating the view that the industrial resources of the Ruhr must be maintained intact as an essential base for the next war—against the Soviet Union. Such talk gives an even more sinister meaning to the projected Western bloc which, in de Gaulle's view, must necessarily embrace the Ruhr.

These same reactionary circles also hold a most distorted and anti-social view of the significance of the atom bomb and its possible uses. Some unbalanced writers in the *Daily Mail* and the *Observer* reached the conclusion immediately following the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that the Anglo-American monopoly of the atom bomb had upset the balance of the United Nations to the advantage of the Western Allies. Since then there has been a steady stream of propaganda implying that this alleged advantage should be utilised to the full before the Soviet Union is able to equip itself with the atomic weapon.

Calculations of this kind, especially when indulged in by a British Field-Marshal, are hardly likely to be well-received by the Soviet public.

At the root of this foolishness is a failure to understand the role that the Soviet Union is playing in world affairs and the respect and admiration that it commands amongst the people of all countries. Politicians who have not yet caught up with the pace of history still toy with the idea of isolating the Soviet Union and holding it back from full participation in world politics.

The fundamental fact which now has to be recognised is that the Soviet Union is a great European and Asiatic power. The significance of this role of the Soviet Union should also be understood by progressive opinion, as it is also the answer to those doubters in the progressive ranks who question the possibilities of carrying through a policy of world co-operation.

The decisions of the Crimea and Berlin Conferences are firmly buttressed by the might of the Soviet Union and they remain the dominant line of the United Nations despite the waverings in London, Paris and Washington.

At the Berlin Conference the leaders of the United Nations worked out in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

detail the treatment of Germany as a defeated aggressor and the road that the German people must follow in order to bring themselves once again into the comity of nations. To set the conception of a Western bloc or "Western Family," as Blum prefers to call it, against the general line of a European peace settlement can result only in harm to Britain and the cause of Allied unity. It could even be the basis for the rebirth of German reaction, basing itself once again on the division between East and West.

France and Europe

by CLEMENS DUTT

THE great question mark in the post-war future of Europe is the position and role of France. It might be thought that this estimate is an exaggeration, that the question of Germany and the possible renaissance of German aggression is a bigger problem. But the Tripartite Conference of Berlin has initiated a post-war development, which, given continued harmony between the major Allied Nations, can lead eventually to the reconstruction of a democratic and peaceful Germany, with all that that will mean for Europe and the world.

The position is quite different from that at the end of the World War No. 1, where it was touch and go whether the foundations of feudal Prussianism would be overthrown in Germany, but where democracy lost because of the victor's fear of Bolshevism. Then for some time Germany was the great question mark and its re-emergence on the old lines—thinly disguised under the Weimar Constitution—determined the development of Europe in a non-democratic direction.

This time it is France that holds a similar balancing position, which is the reason why the outcome of the present struggle for a new, democratic France is fateful for Europe.

France has lost its pre-war predominance in Europe, but its relative importance in Europe now is very great. The struggle for a new, democratic France is part and parcel of the profound struggle between the forces of democracy and fascism which the war set in motion in all the formerly occupied or satellite European countries. Owing to the relative importance of France in the outcome of this struggle it will have a preponderant influence for the future of Europe as a whole.

France could have been the model for the deep social changes involved in the extirpation of the roots of fascism; it should have led the way along the path essential for the triumph of democracy along which a number of countries in Eastern Europe are travelling. Unfortunately, these deep social changes so far have not been carried through in France, or only in a half-hearted manner, and therefore the problem remains of France's role in Europe. At the same time it demonstrates the close interconnection between domestic and foreign policy.

Under the leadership of General de Gaulle who has, to an important extent been left in power, and supported by, forces essentially Vichyist in outlook, French foreign policy has been vacillating and weak.

France is too war-ruined and impoverished to recover by her own unaided efforts. But to which of the biggest powers should she look for aid? It was to prevent acceptance of such aid becoming economic or political dependence, as much as to ensure security from a possible renewal of German aggression, that de Gaulle sponsored the idea of a Western European bloc, a closely-built grouping of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States of Western Europe which could include Britain and of which, as de Gaulle said, the Rhine would be one of the commercial arteries, meaning that it would extend to the territory east of the Rhine. The idea of such a bloc, though not necessarily de Gaulle's interpretation of it, fitted in pretty closely with the views of the British Foreign Office under Eden.

The dangers of this orientation were immediately seen by the forces of French democracy. Instead of this hypothetical scheme, they compelled the realisation of the immediately practicable Franco-Soviet alliance as the essential cornerstone for French security and revival.

But the Franco-Soviet pact was not followed by closer Franco-Soviet co-operation in solving the war and post-war problems of Europe. It did not result in France being invited to take part in the Crimea conference. Consequently de Gaulle decided to ignore the possibilities of this Pact and instead turned his attention to the U.S.A.

At San Francisco, France did not support the Soviet Union on the question nor the democratic demand for the exclusion of the Argentine. But, apparently, in spite of arrangements for a considerable economic aid from the U.S.A., the recent visit of de Gaulle to Washington did not bring the desired fruits either.

In spite of the tension in the Near East, which has been a major source of coolness between Britain and France, General de Gaulle has now come full circle and returned to the idea of a Western European bloc.

In an outspoken statement on the eve of the conference of Foreign Ministers in London, de Gaulle insisted that the basis for close Anglo-French relations should be the development of Western Europe as a "natural complex," which if not self-sufficient, "would have the same sort of completeness that is possessed by the other economic masses of the world in face of which it would not be in a position of inferiority."

This emphasis is something quite different from the traditional French demand for the separation of the Ruhr and Rhineland, on the grounds of French security, as voiced by Marshal Foch at the end of the last war.

Not only does the objection that a bloc implies a counter-bloc, and that therefore the proposal must inevitably be directed against the Soviet Union, hold true in general terms, but the very language used by de Gaulle in speaking of not being "inferior" to other "economic masses" can, as regards Europe, only imply intended rivalry with Soviet influence.

The attempted justification on the ground that France and Britain would only be doing in Western Europe what the Soviet Union has done in the Eastern part is not only an anti-Soviet description of Russia's efforts, but is itself a confession that the aim is to establish an oppositional zone based on this misreading of Soviet policy. The gradual working out of the Crimea and Berlin Agreements brings concrete evidence, in the nature of the differences that have arisen and have had to be settled, that the essential question for the countries of Eastern Europe and the Balkans is whether the conditions for free democratic development shall be created or not, and not in any way the question of establishing a zone of influence for the Soviet Union.

It is sufficient to note, also, that the chief sponsors of a Western bloc have always been and are conservative, reactionary circles in Britain and reactionary, fascist circles abroad. It is not accidental that praise for the idea is voiced strongly in Franco-Spain or that Quisling in Norway outlined a similar scheme as his proposal for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creating a barrier to "bolshevisation" of Europe. He, at least, saw clearly that such a bloc is bound to be the starting point for the re-emergence in some form of Hitler's "New Order" for Europe.

Why does General de Gaulle make this the basis for his approach to an Anglo-French alliance? Precisely because it gives him the best chance of dividing the left and rallying the right and securing a victory in the coming general elections in France.

de Gaulle's policy of moderate reaction internally and aggressive feebleness externally, with the idea of playing off the big three powers one against the other, is not popular in France. Nevertheless, there is a deep feeling of friendship towards Britain among the masses of the French people. The arrival of a Labour government in Britain has greatly encouraged the socialists in France, who are orientating their policy on that of the British Labour Party. In so far as British Labour Party policy supports the idea of a Western bloc, it carries with it the French socialists. In this sphere, therefore, as in internal affairs, de Gaulle and his supporters of the Catholic centre seek to make a coalition with the socialists which would keep him in power and keep the left divided. He is well aware of the danger of being in tow to British influence, but on the principle of preferring to reign in hell rather than serve in heaven, he would like France to be the leader in a reactionary bloc rather than a simple supporter of democracy in Europe.

Hence the elections will be crucial for the character of French policy, both internal and external, and for French influence on the deep, social changes desired by the peoples of Europe.

With a solid basis of Socialist-Communist unity the left would triumph in France and would give incalculable weight to the fulfilment of the Berlin decisions and the efforts of the peoples to establish a democratic future in Europe. Unless such unity is established, France will remain torn by internal struggle and political muddle, and will remain a question mark as far as the democratic future of Europe is concerned.

If the problems of democracy and security are to be solved, it is essential that Anglo-French relations should be based, not on partnership in an anti-Soviet orientation, but on a democratic union of the peoples throughout Europe, on support for collective security and on the vital Anglo-Soviet and Franco-Soviet Alliances. Only in this framework can an Anglo-French treaty be successfully implemented.

Problems of Labour Unity in Norway

by GEORGE RUDE

DURING June and July of this year it seemed that the Norwegian labour movement was going to make history as one of the first since the split in the international labour movement after the last war to achieve political and organisational unity by the merging of the Norwegian Labour Party (D.N.A.) and Norwegian Communist Party (N.K.P.) into one party of the working-class.

Background

In spite of Norway's attachment to the "Sterling Bloc" and Norwegian Labour's close connection with Transport House, Reformism has never had the same degree of influence in Norway as it has had in the other Scandinavian and North-Western European countries. In 1919 the Norwegian Labour Party (then a united body) joined the Communist Inter-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national, though it came out of it in 1923 on the issue of "collective membership" and the Norwegian Communists broke away to form their own party. Again, the Norwegian trade unions only came into the International Federation in 1934—with the express mandate of fighting for international unity. In 1936-8 they parted from their British, Danish, Swedish, Dutch and Belgian colleagues in the historical international meetings held in London, Oslo and Warsaw by supporting the Spanish and French unions in the demand for the inclusion of the Soviet trade unions. At this time the Norwegian Communist Party was a small body with only 3-4,000 members, the bulk of the union membership were collectively affiliated to the Labour Party (whose leaders played a "centrist" role in the Second International) and organisational unity between the two parties did not arise in a practical form.

But during the war years, when the Communists proved themselves to be the most effective leaders of the internal struggle against fascism and the German occupation—particularly in the organised sabotage work—and the flower of the nation's youth flocked into their ranks with a resultant tenfold increase in the Party's membership and influence, the demand for political unity arose as a very practical and immediate question. In January, 1942, an approach by N.K.P. to D.N.A. for joint action against fascism led to the publication of a joint manifesto to the Norwegian working-class. Further proposals for united action were made by N.K.P. in September, 1943, and more detailed negotiations were carried on in correspondence between Peder Furubotn on behalf of N.K.P. and the Trade Union Secretariat established in Stockholm in October, 1944-February, 1945.

The Joint Programme

The result was that Norway's liberation in May, 1945, was followed by a stream of resolutions from factories, trade unions and labour organisations urging the T.U.C. to take the initiative in bringing the two working-class parties together in order to create a single party of the working-class. This spontaneous demand, which sprang from the workers' own experience of the successful joint activity against the invaders, was so universal and so overwhelming that even the most hardened opponents of unity in the leadership of D.N.A., with Martin Tranmael at their head, had to accede to it. On June 8, under the presidency of the T.U.C.'s chairman, Konrad Nordahl, the three labour organisations began to negotiate with the aim of achieving unity in two stages—(*a*) agreement on a joint programme; (*b*) organisational unity by the merging of the two parties.

The first stage was rapidly reached; on June 28 both the Communist *Friheten* and the Labour *Arbeiderbladet* published the joint programme, of which the following are some of the major points:—

1. A basic programme of popular rights (freedom of education, religion and conscience, speech, press, organisation, strike, individual inviolability, etc.) and extension of democracy in order to make possible the peaceful transition to Socialism.

2. A national programme of economic reconstruction based on the fullest use of resources and popular intiative.

3. A programme of popular reforms (wages, housing, health, social insurance, a democratic army and police force, a people's Government).

4. A foreign policy based on the Charter of the United Nations, friendship with the Soviet Union and international labour unity.

Such a programme, carried out by a united working-class, would tear out the remnants of fascism by the roots, destroy the domination of Norway's economic life by foreign finance capi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tal, release a virile, democratic upsurge which would transform the whole nation's political and economic life, and make possible an early advance to Socialism by peaceful means.

Steps towards Organisational Unity

The question now was, how to proceed to the next stage? Here a basic difference of approach immediately revealed itself. The leaders of the Labour Party, backed by the trade union representatives on the negotiating committee, wanted to proceed to an immediate merger of the two parties before the election—a merger from *above*, in which the Labour Party's pre-war membership of 170,000 (overwhelmingly accounted for by trade union collective affiliation) should be thrown into the scales as a bargaining counter during a period when the Communist Party's rapidly growing membership was still in the process of being registered and organised. This purpose was clearly revealed in D.N.A.'s programme for organisational unity submitted on July 5 (and from whose essentials its spokesmen have never budged since), which included proposals for a proportional allocation of seats in Parliament, seats on committees, delegates to joint electoral meetings—all on a "quota" basis, while it was proposed to solve the problem of the workers' press by insisting that *Friheten* (present circulation 95,000) should be wound up in favour of *Arbeiderbladet* (present circulation 60,000).

The Communists saw the problem quite differently. The resolution on Unity Negotiations adopted by their enlarged central committee on July 13 welcomed the adoption of the joint programme as a step towards organisational unity, but urged that certain immediate measures be taken to ensure effective political co-operation of the two parties before proceeding to a merger. These include (*a*) joint Labour-Communist local committees to take up immediate issues arising from the programme by meetings, deputations, etc.; (*b*) election of workers' production committees in the factories; (*c*) training of officials and leading cadres of the two parties in Marxism; (*d*) constitution of a Joint Commission of Enquiry to study and report on reactionary trends in Labour's policy up to April 9, 1940 (date of the German invasion) with a view to cleansing the labour movement of alien influences

This attempt by the Communists to ensure that the groundwork for unity had been effectively prepared before proceeding to build the single party of the working-class was immediately assailed in *Arbeiderbladet* as a clear proof that the Communist Party were lukewarm about the whole question of labour unity.

However, these provocations failed and, following further indications of the widespread popular demand for labour unity, the T.U.C. invited the two parties to resume negotiations by agreeing to set up a Unity Committee of three from each party and two from the trade unions with the task of preparing local joint meetings to select parliamentary and municipal candidates and a joint Unity Congress on September 2 at which the new united Labour Party should be constituted, following separate national congresses. The principle of one paper in each main centre should be agreed and all other outstanding issues left over for settlement by the Unity Committee. This proposition was accepted by both parties and the Unity Committee—consisting of Konrad Nordahl and Gunnar Brathen for the T.U.C., Peder Furubotn, Ornulf Egge and Ujell Kirberg for the Communist Party and of Einar Gerhardsen, Trygve Bratteli and Martin Tranmael for the Labour Party—held its first meeting on July 25. This agreement was welcomed with tremendous enthu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siasm by all the progressive forces in the country and with unconcealed despair by the Conservative *Morgenbladet*, which immediately proposed a United Front of the Conservative, Liberal and Peasant Parties to oppose United Labour at the General Election.

Breakdown

However, these high hopes were only too soon to be disappointed. After three successful meetings of the Unity Committee, at which unanimous decisions were taken in preparation for the elections, it soon became evident that the Labour Party and T.U.C. representatives were not prepared to budge from the main propositions outlined in D.N.A.'s programme of July 5. Discussions were reduced to haggling over the proportion of "safe" seats which the Communists were going to be allowed to contest, the proportion of Communist to Labour delegates to the proposed joint selection meetings, the proportion of Communist to Labour Party members at the Unity Congress in September, the insistence that one working-class paper meant that *Friheten* must give way to *Arbeiderbladet*, etc. The Communists vainly urged that the best candidate should be put forward regardless of previous party affiliation, that there must be parity of representation at selection meetings and Unity Congress—they were in a minority and were consistently outvoted by five to three. When *Friheten* publicly exposed these tactics, N.K.P. was accused of trying to provoke a breach. On August 20 the T.U.C. addressed a letter to both Party Secretariats asking them to pledge themselves to stand by all the decisions taken hitherto by the Unity Committee. The Labour Party replied in an unconditional affirmative, the Communist Party replied that it would do so until the Party Congress met on August 30, but that Congress, as the leading organ of the Party, must have the right to pronounce judgment in the matter. On August 23, at the instance of the Labour Party Executive, the T.U.C. called off all further negotiations on the grounds that N.K.P.'s answer was "unsatisfactory" and that the "unfriendly tone" of *Friheten* proved that the Communist leaders were opposed to organisational unity.

Intervention in Norway's Affairs

This is, of course, not the last round in the struggle for labour unity in Norway. N.K.P.'s Congress decision to work for local unity on every immediate issue affecting the workers' interests and the growing strength of Communist membership and influence will lead to further attempts, on a sounder basis than hitherto, to satisfy the great hunger of the Norwegian working-class for a united party of the working-class. But what caused this breakdown after such a promising start?

It is not without significance that in the middle of this final phase of negotiations in Norway—on August 16—the French Socialist Party Congress, attended by Professor Laski, Chairman of the British Labour Party, rejected the French Communist Party's unity proposals by 1,112 to 274 votes. Professor Laski was also present at the Danish Labour Party Conference in Copenhagen (also attended by Einar Gerhardsen, Chairman of the Norwegian Labour Party) which on August 22 (the day before the breach in Norway) slammed the door on further unity discussions with the Danish Communists. On August 23 Professor Laski arrived in Oslo with Mr. Morgan Phillips to attend the Norwegian Labour Party Conference which, as we have seen, refused even to consider electoral unity with the Communists. At this Conference one of the foreign delegates was tactless enough

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to state that the British Labour Party was trying to resurrect the old Second International and hinted fairly broadly that labour unity in Norway would not be very helpful towards the attainment of such an aim.

It is in the best interests of the British working-class to see that no interference is tolerated in the internal affairs of Norway's labour movement which, if allowed to solve its own problems, may still lead the world in creating a single party of the working-class.

Dawn Over East Asia

by ARTHUR CLEGG

IT was fitting that the Second World War, which began on September 18, 1931, with the occupation of Mukden by the Japanese Kwantung Army, should have ended in Manchuria with the rout of that army by Soviet troops. On September 2, 1945, almost fourteen years later to a day, the world heard Stalin saying:—

Utterly defeated on the seas and on land, and surrounded on all sides by the armed forces of the United Nations, Japan acknowledged her defeat and laid down her arms. . . . Now we can say that the conditions necessary for the peace of the world have already been won.

As the defeat of Hitlerite Germany ushered in a new period in Europe, so the defeat of imperialist Japan ushers in a new period for the Far East, a period in which the necessary conditions for peace now won must be turned into the foundations of lasting peace.

This new pacific period sees the eclipse of the Japanese empire, the emergence of the Soviet Union as a Pacific power, the preponderance of American military and economic power in contrast to the territorial preponderance of the old European empires, and the emergence of all Eastern peoples into mass political activity.

The disappearance of the Japanese Empire is the central feature. In 1937, after over fifty years of aggression, this empire stretched from the Kuriles in the north to the Carolines, 3,000 miles to the south; and from Formosa in the west to the Marshalls, 3,000 miles to the east. It included four great eastern provinces of China and the whole of Korea. These island chains held Vladivostock a prisoner, separated the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. by sea, and, in great degree, separated China and the Philippines on the one side from the United States on the other.

By the Cairo Declaration and by the Potsdam Terms all this is changed. Japan is reduced to her original four home islands. China's territory is restored; southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles return to the Soviet Union, which now has unhampered access to the Pacific; Korea is "in due course" to be independent; while other islands will come under the trustee scheme of the International Organisation with U.S.A. as trustee.

But when the rulers of Japan began their career of conquest they began from the four islands, and merely to reduce the Japanese warlords to those islands is by no means the same thing as rooting out the forces of aggression in Japan.

The Potsdam Terms therefore envisage more than just territorial restriction: "There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest . . . stern justice will be meted out to war criminals. . . .The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion and of thought, as well as respect for fundamental human rights shall be established.''

In addition there are to be ''just reparations,'' Japan will not be permitted to maintain "those industries which will enable her to rearm for war,'' and the Japanese military forces are to be ''completely disarmed.''

To enforce these terms there is to be a partial military occupation, which will continue until they have been fulfilled ''and there has been established, in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people, a peacefully inclined and responsible government.''

Thus the Terms have as their goal a democratic and peaceful Japan. But whereas in Germany the creation of democracy is a direct responsibility of the occupying forces, in Japan it is the responsibility of the Japanese government. Therefore the composition of that government is crucial to the whole success of the scheme.

This key position of the government has been further emphasised by the decision of the United States military authorities (who nominate the Supreme Allied Commander) that there is to be no Military Government in Japan. ''The government of Japan will be accomplished through the country's own governmental organisation by the Civil Affairs Section of the Supreme Commander's staff'' (*Times*, September 4, 1945).

It is a well-known and widely recognised fact that there has never been a democratic Japan even in the ruling class British and American sense, let alone in that of ''government by the people.'' This is for three reasons:

First, the Japanese constitution, while it provided for an elected House of Representatives, made the government responsible not to that House but to the Emperor, while other laws gave the army and navy absolute control over their own ministers. Thus every Japanese government has been responsible not to the people, but directly to Court and military circles. The reference in the Terms to ''responsible government'' means that this system must be ended.

Second, even in the heyday of the ''moderates'' in the 1920s, freedom of speech, of press and of association were heavily limited. Thus the Japanese Communist Party, while ''tolerated'' from 1922 to 1928, was never legal. After 1928 all progressive organisations and individuals met an increasing repression which became absolute after 1933. So-called ''left'' organisations that were legal after that date, such as the Social Mass Party, were fascist inclined, and their leadership served the purposes of the military. It is noticeable in the Terms that while freedom of speech is mentioned specifically, freedom of association is not. ''Fundamental human rights,'' however, cannot but include this freedom for all except fascist and militarist organisations.

Meanwhile, Lt.-Gen. Ishiwara, adviser of the East Asia Federation,* announced on August 28 that ''republican, social and other parties would be formed in Japan.'' Obviously Ishiwari had in mind parties created by the Japanese General Staff, and some of these parties have now been set up. Who are the real friends of democracy in Japan will not be clear yet awhile.

Third, since the Meiji Restoration, ruling power in Japan has been the tight preserve of the big financial-industrial houses (Mitsui, Mitsubishi, and eight other concerns), and the big landlords. They have controlled the Emperor, the court circles, the

* The war organisation for buttressing Japanese rule over conquered territories.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high army and navy officers, and the two main political parties, the Minseito and Seiyukai, and, since these were dissolved, the fascist Imperial Rule Assistance Association, its Parliamentary Association, and the Sanyo Hokokai, the fascist Labour front. It is they who have built up and maintained the system of Emperor worship. Since 1928, and particularly since 1933, any opponent of this tight ruling group has been ruthlessly persecuted.

To-day these formerly persecuted open opponents of the regime, be they Liberals, Socialists or Communists, are the only force that can give birth to a democratic Japan. They alone can carry through the reforms envisaged by the Potsdam terms, form a really responsible and peacefully-minded government, and carry out the necessary breaking up of the big estates and big trusts.

A government of landlords and big banker-industrialists can never be peacefully-minded, for the hard economic fact in Japan is that the peasants are so poverty-stricken by high rents and high interest rates, and the workers are so destitute as a result of low wages and high interest rates, that Japan, despite her 70 million population, has a very small internal market; and the owners of her mass production industries, heavy or light, constantly seek to capture markets abroad. Moreover, landlords and industrialists, seeking to divert the masses from wage and rent strikes, have necessarily to whip up feeling against other nations.

This is a commonplace even in Conservative circles in Britain and America. Thus *The Times* wrote editorially on August 27:—

It is indeed already clear that the rulers of Japan do not yet recognise either the fact or the implication of what the allies believe and intend to be the conclusive defeat of Japanese aggression; and while they retain their hold over the people, the growth of those democratic institutions to which the Potsdam terms point must remain a mere facade.

Yet so uncertain are even the most anti-fascist members of these Conservative groups in their policy towards Japan that the same paper, in an editorial on September 3, completely reversed its policy and argued that these rulers be given a second chance on probation, saying:—

Only its practice, as contrasted with its professions, can show whether this class (the present governing class—A.C.) is capable of accepting the consequences of defeat wholeheartedly enough to make it an appropriate guide for the Japanese nation throughout the stern period of probation which the Allies are bound to impose.

Other members of Conservative circles in Britain and America do not feel themselves bound even by the scruples expressed by *The Times* in its second leader. They are actively opposed to turning the military defeat of Japan into the political defeat of Japanese fascism and imperialism.

Thus the *Economist*, on August 25, in an article on "Far Eastern Melting Pot," was not even concerned about a "probation period" for the Japanese rulers, but wrote "the question is rather whether their national structure can survive the impact of such a defeat" (i.e., the military defeat already inflicted) and, as a solution:—

Since their emancipation and westernisation last century, the Japanese have led the field of China's foreign conquerors and exploiters. Now they are, in their turn, conquered and exposed to American and Russian control. General Chiang has long preached to his people the necessity of eventual reconciliation with the Japanese, who are, after all, an Asiatic people. In the present state of confusion and conflict in East Asia, there is just a chance that the reconciliation may come sooner than anyone expects.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This question of "reconciliation" with China is at the moment featured rather prominently in the fascist press of Japan.

A similar attitude to Japan is to be found in the Isolationist and right-wing press of the United States. Indeed, after victory in Europe there began in the United States an open clamour for a negotiated peace with Japan. The *New York Herald Tribune* on July 24 recorded that

> those Americans who fear and distrust Soviet Russia are among the most ardent advocates of a compromise peace with Japan. The idea behind their arguments seems to be that Japan would be useful as a buffer state to aid control of Russian activities in the Far East.

Thus it is clear that the political struggle for the Potsdam goal of a democratic Japan will have to be waged not only against the fascist rulers of Japan, but also against their friends abroad.

Why is there this friendship for a reactionary Japan? It is doubtful if the above quotation from the *Herald Tribune* really hits the nail fully on the head. Fundamentally it is because they see the dawn coming up over Asia, and fear it, that powerful imperialist groups in Britain and America, together with reactionary circles in China, adopt their present attitude to the rulers of Japan. This dawn is the political awakening of the masses of people in Asia.

The last war, which scarcely touched Asia militarily or politically, nevertheless resulted in powerful national movements in a number of countries. This war began in Asia and has involved all Asiatic countries and islands, both politically and militarily, in the most intense manner. Asia has seen the defeat of its European overlords, cruel Japanese occupation accompanied by far-reaching Japanese propaganda, and the growth of wide, armed resistance movements against the Japanese and for independence. Only the position in Burma is adequately known at the moment, but there it is clear that the 200,000 strong Burma Freedom League has wholly transformed the political life of the country.

Nor will present plans for great increases in trade with Asiatic countries ever permit Eastern peoples to relapse into their past slumber.

These are facts, powerful and indubitable, which have long been agitating the chancelleries of the world, dividing politicians into those who welcome the new, those who fear it, and those who, either from mental palsy or intellectual sterility, limit their activities to tossing pennies.

The Rooseveltian programme for Asia was to welcome the new. The fullest expression of that programme is to be found in the joint Sino-American Statement issued at the conclusion of the visit of then Vice-President Wallace to China in June, 1944 and in the Vice-President's accompanying speech. That visit followed Teheran and Cairo.

It was a brief programme of six points and, while deliberately not free from ambiguity, was full of meaning. Japan was to be demilitarised; there was to be a mutual understanding between China and the Soviet Union, China's nearest great neighbour; a democratic and united China was envisaged; presently dependent peoples were to be given "self-government" within a term of years; the United States did not seek exclusive arrangements with China and opposed "political combinations which exclude us;" both industrialization and agrarian reform in Asia were approved.

Naturally, the carrying out and carrying forward of this programme was, and is, the concern not only of the Roosevelt coalition in the United States, but of all progressive peoples. Thus the mutual understanding be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween China and the Soviet Union has been achieved in a Treaty between these two countries and the demilitarisation of Japan will be accomplished by all the United Nations in the strict fulfilment of the Potsdam terms. The other points have still to be accomplished.

Equally naturally, powerful circles in the United States and many other countries oppose this programme.

In Britain some of these circles advocate a "western bloc" directed against both the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., one of whose chief attractions, to their minds, is not just "European solidarity," but the fact that almost all members would be powers with great imperial possessions and could together, they hope, dominate not only Europe, but Africa and Asia too.

For years they regarded Imperial Japan as the king-pin of their own imperial structure. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was concluded by the Tories in 1902. Thirty-five years later a Tory Prime Minister sat calmly by while Britons were stripped in Tientsin, rather than go against Japan "in word or in deed." It is therefore not surprising that today these same circles, learning and forgetting nothing, should desire a "western bloc" stretching from London to Tokyo. They realise that the defeat of Japanese imperialism is their own defeat and hasten to try to repair the breach in their walls.

A second line of defence of these circles is to use American finance to reinsure their position. Thus the Dutch Government-in-exile negotiated loans from private American banking houses such as Chase National, reportedly secured on rubber, tin, etc., from the Netherlands East Indies. Certainly at San Franciso, when it came to writing the goal of independence for presently dependent peoples into the International Charter (as proposed by the Soviet Union, Philippines, etc.) the United States delegation appeared to be in retreat from positions formerly taken up by official spokesmen. The tendency of American monopoly capital to prop up the old empires is certainly a main danger for colonial peoples.

The third line of defence is the creation of "Japanese" social and economic conditions in a number of countries, such as has been done in the Middle East.

Nevertheless, the forces which favour the new are strong and a careful reading of the Charter shows that under it great advances can be made.

Indeed, the number of independent countries in Asia has already been increased by this war. By the Soviet-Chinese Treaty the Mongolian Peoples Republic passes from *de facto* to *de jure* independence and will soon be appearing in the councils of the world, while Korea, though it has to undergo a term of military occupation, cannot long be denied the independence which is her declared right.

For the future of Asia China possesses a key position. The present discussions between Chinese Communist leaders and Kuomintang leaders will eventually result in a united and democratic China. The road will not be easy (one has only to remember the wartime growth of landlordism in China to see that) and even with a successful outcome of the present and succeeding talks, the democratic people of China will need the firmest friendship from other peoples. But once the Chinese people have built their own democracy they will be able to render powerful help to all other Asiatic peoples struggling with manifold problems.

However, it is we in Britain who, in the last analysis, have to decide whether eastern democracy is to come peacefully. We are the centre of the whole imperial system built up in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

19th century and now in its inevitable decline. Our positive interest in the East can only be in trade, in peace and in the spread and intermingling of knowledge and culture; and never in territory. In the modern world colonial possessions are as big a burden around our necks politically, militarily and economically as they are to the colonial peoples. Already we see this when soldiers who could be demobilised are ordered to stay east, not to defeat the Japanese, but for police purposes that could be served far better by the peoples of eastern countries themselves.

The interests of British labour are to see the spread of political liberty, the rise and increase of trade unionism, and prosperity for worker and peasant in Asia no less than Europe. In the terms of the San Francisco Charter, in the workings of the International Organisation, in subsidiary organs like that for Food and Agriculture, and in the World T.U.C. we, the people of Britain, have instruments in our hands to accomplish these goals.

But the greatest instrument of all is active friendship with the workers, peasants and intellectuals from the various countries of Asia, and ceaseless pressure to see that our governments, present and future, meet the demands of those peoples.

Of all the manifold problems which now confront us, the spread of democracy through Asia is, in terms of history, by far the most important. To its achievement we must devote ourselves for the next twenty years. We need peace as intensely as any other country, and this is the chief way in which we can play our part in transforming the conditions of peace now won into a peace that will endure.

Book Reviews

Patrick Geddes

Patrick Geddes, Maker of the Future by Philip Boardman, with an Introduction by Lewis Mumford (Chapel Hill Press, 1944, $5.) and O.U.P. 30/-,.

PATRICK GEDDES (botanist, biologist, sociologist) was a teacher of great popularity and vitality. He was an active reformer and town planner.

Very early in his academic career it was rumoured of his botany lectures—"they say he drags in matters of economics at the slightest provocation." This did not please his superiors, who were frequently criticised by Geddes. He wished to "end the separation of the school of industry from the school of science, which creates pedants in the universities and Philistines in the factories. "He was an untiring critic of the university system. He hated unchanging curricula, and once said "the universities are frankly museums for the preservation of intellectual antiquities."

The main weakness in Geddes' life appears to have been an overdeveloped habit of progressive and semi-idealistic thinking, offset by an underdeveloped appreciation of the need for realistic political action. He was an active man, but most of his reformist activity took a very individualistic form. He never really got down to suggesting "how" we should create the conditions for progress. He objected to "hate-encrusted political labels." For Geddes hate was not a positive factor in life.

Despite the fact that he detested "labels," despite also his mechanical discipleship to Le Play and Auguste Comte, P.G. was a "socialist at heart." His soundness of heart, however, was not always equalled by his depth of understanding. He was rather inclined to attack social problems "by himself" and by segments. For example, he tried, vainly, to show what a "good" colonial policy might do for Cyprus, instead of seeing that colonial policy was tied up with the whole economic structure of the society he was living in. He therefore failed to appreciate the need for attacking the *whole idea* of colonial domination.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The "Sir Patrick" Geddes who has come down to us as a sociologist was chiefly famed for his tremendous energy in carrying out "Regional Surveys" and advocating radical urban transformations. He was the first of the great town planners, and Sir Patrick Abercrombie is in his direct line of descent. In town planning he was a violent opponent of planning piecemeal, or by segments, and believed in the necessity of a preliminary thorough economico-historical diagnosis of the region to be planned. It was Geddes who inspired the Monumental Survey of Greater New York, completed in 1934.

Patrick Geddes was a big-minded naturalist: had he lived half a century later he might well have been a Marxist as well. Not "a maker of the future" in any superlative sense, but a great planning visionary and a great opponent of intellectual cant.

H. S. P.

Shorter Notice

The Land and its Problems. Oxford Pamphlet on Indian Affairs (No. 9) by T. Vijayaraghevacharya (9*d*, O.U.P.).

The Untouchables of India by Louise Ouwerkerk (1*s*, O.U.P.).

MR. VIJAYARAGHEVACHARYA'S pamphlet is an informative description of the crops of India and of the land and the climatic conditions in which they grow. But it will be of far less interest to readers who wish to understand and solve Indian problems than previous publications in this series, such as, for instance, the excellent pamphlets on Food Supply and on Health. The impression is gained that the land of India is capable of great scientific development, but the author too scrupulously avoids touching upon any of the social or political obstacles that at present hinder this development. He believes the traditional conservatism of the Indian peasantry prevents the use of machinery or collective farming.

Miss Ouwerkerk treats the problem of the Untouchables sympathetically. She finds that the fundamental problem for them is . . . whether or not to seek to improve their position by fighting to maintain and extend the number of their "reserved seats" in the Legislature and in public services. She sees that for them to do so is to run the risk of perpetuating their isolation in Indian society instead of breaking it down. But she offers no solution to the dilemma.

M.C.

Publications Received

BOOKS

Electricity—Public or Private Monopoly? by F. Hamlyn Dennis (V. Gollancz, 7*s*6*d*, 144 pp.).

A Short History of Labour Conditions in Germany, 1800 to the Present Day by Jurgen Kuczynski (Frederick Muller, 9*s*6*d*, 268 pp.).

Gentile and Jew. A Symposium edited by Chaim Newman (Alliance Press, 12*s*6*d*, 372 pp.).

Guaranteed Annual Wages by Chernick and Hellickson (The University of Minnesota Press (O.U.P., 15*s*6*d*, 146 pp.).

Freedom Under Planning by Barbara Wootton (Allen & Unwin, 6*s*, 164 pp.).

The Jews and Palestine by S. Levenberg (Poale Zion-Jewish Socialist Labour Party, 402 pp.).

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s., from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3s. a year inclusive of postage.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in September, 1945 : £83 : 6 : 8

A RACE FOR TIME

"Please accept our very best wishes for the future of the LABOUR MONTHLY and a small donation to assist in the realisation of such wishes."

This reply to our last month's appeal to readers symbolises the response which we hoped to receive. The Fund Total, too, £83 6s. 8d. (as compared with £68 9s. 2d. last month) is an indication that others of our readers have rallied to our support. Thank you readers!

Nevertheless, we are still falling short of our target of £100. Why do we ask for £100? Because this is the minimum needed if we, in our turn, are to give you the 100 per cent. LABOUR MONTHLY. One hundred per cent., not only in articles, but also in actual production. Nobody likes the blue paper, all of us would like to see more articles and of a wider range, but without money we shall be handicapped before the race is scheduled to start.

We have fourteen thousand readers. If 100 per cent. of our readers responded to the needs of the Fund, we should be well away!

WILL YOU HELP US MAKE THIS FLYING START?

	£	s.	d.
J. Murphy		13	0
F. Lane		2	0
C. Harding	1	1	0
E. Putnam		5	0
R. Hodgart		3	0
N. Kelly		6	6
O. Mangeot		1	0
Anon.		3	0
R. Barrett		10	0
G. Robertson		3	0
J. R. McCormack		1	6
A. Wall		5	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
R. Mecredy	1	0	0
J. W. Turner		8	0
A. A. Woolf		5	0
Radio Mechanic, R.E.M.E.		10	0
C. Sharpe		8	0
E. Walton		3	0
Journalist		5	0
F. Russell		3	4
H. S. M.		2	6
E. S. Stiff		5	0
A. Ryle		13	0
D. Gardner		3	0
Forces, per D. A. H.	1	0	0
T. Oliver		13	0
W. Graham		3	0
B. Stevens		7	6
J. Purton	1	0	0
Signalman, B.L.A.		10	0
Mr. & Mrs. Humphreys		2	6
M. Darby		3	0
M. R. Turner		3	0
F. Clark & Friends	1	2	8
A. Taylor		3	0
One more R.E.M.E.		6	6
R.E.M.E.		10	0
A. E., R.A.O.C.		10	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
H. Heinemann		8	0
F. A. C., Ex-Rhodesia	5	0	0
J. Macdonald		3	0
E. Reckitt	1	0	0
W. Maddison	1	0	0
F. Renouf		3	0
L. H. Mills		13	0
G. Richardson		3	0
A. ffrench		3	0
G. Robson		5	0
J. Peterson		13	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
D. Rees		10	0
E. Belsey		5	0
A. E. Pearson		2	6
J. Davenport	3	0	0
R. G. U., R.A.C.	1	0	0
E. E. Godfrey		3	0
J. Gehl		5	0
W. Burbridge		2	6
Lower Morden D.G.		2	6
V.A.D.		5	0
Two Gunners, C.M.F.		12	6
Penrith D.G.		5	0
E. M. Addyman		3	0
J. B.		15	0
A. Wynne	1	0	0
Director	2	0	0
S. Mill		10	0
M. Lane		7	0
B. Close		1	10
Anon.		15	0
C. Rainbow		3	0
H. E. Hodson	1	0	0
Learner		2	0
K. B. Kay		10	0
R. Anderson		7	6
H. Braybrook		5	0
G. F. Burn	1	0	0
H. S. Lee		6	10
E. Thomas		6	0
M. W.		3	0
C. J. Turner		3	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
Sgt. Kelly	1	0	0
K. J.	12	3	0
M. Chattaway		10	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
J. Pack		3	0
E. R. Page		3	0
Forces, per D. A. H.	1	0	0
Anon., Whitchurch		1	0
F. E. Stehr		5	0
F. Snowden		3	0
H. Ross		14	0
J. J. Trott		6	0
W. Burbridge		2	6
A. Crosby		3	0
B. Stevens		2	6
Eight of the Boys		10	0
G. J. Morey	1	5	0
J. Macdonald		3	0
T. Williams		3	0
W. Lowe		3	0
H. Wolff		6	0
Anon.	1	15	0
R. Hart		13	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
W. G. King		13	0
A. Wynne		3	0
The Bacon Family		6	0
R. F. Brown		3	0
Smoke		10	0
R. Pearson		2	6
D. Stenton		13	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
L'Humanite		2	0
B. Soper		14	0
E. McCallum		5	6
C. Nettleton		13	0
W. Breach	1	0	0
A. M. Robbie		3	0
D. N. L.		6	6
R. Green		3	0
M. Nicholas		2	0
L. Gibbins		13	0
Anon.		13	0
V.A.D.		5	0
Radio Mechanic, R.E.M.E.		10	0
J. P.		2	0
W. M.		2	6
R. P.		2	6
W. R.		2	6
A. Bruce		3	0
F. M. R.		5	0
E. Thompson		3	0
H. S. M.		2	6
B. M. Pratt		7	0
I. McIntyre		3	6

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DAILY WORKER MAKES NEWSPAPER HISTORY

We have great pleasure in announcing to the labour movement the launching of a Co-operative Society, to be known as the People's Press Printing Society Limited; which will undertake the printing and publishing of the *Daily Worker*.

Despite the difficulties of wartime publication, the *Daily Worker* has made huge strides in technique and organisation. As the result of the continued support of its readers—particularly those in the labour movement—the *Daily Worker* has acquired some of the most up-to-date machinery in the country. Its present circulation of 110,000—to which it is limited only by newspaper rationing—is less than a half of what could be sold to satisfy present demand. Never has its standing been so high.

True to its democratic traditions, the *Daily Worker* is making newspaper history by becoming the only daily newspaper in Britain which is truly owned by its readers. The formation of the People's Press Printing Society will enable every shareholder to have a voice in the affairs of the *Daily Worker*.

Write for more information to The Secretary,
PEOPLE'S PRESS PRINTING SOCIETY LTD.,
(Dept. J) Swinton House, 324, Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

Now Available

BRITISH TRADE UNIONISM

A Short History

G. ALLEN HUTT *3s. 6d.*

In this new and enlarged edition the author has added a chapter dealing with the war years and the changes which have taken place in trade union structure and policy during this eventful time.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2003 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED